

Research Paper**SOCIAL JUSTICE UNIT**

RESEARCH PAPER # 5 – JUNE 2011

Understanding School Responses to Students' Challenging Behaviour

A Review of Literature

Samia Michail

Research and Program Development
Social Justice Unit
UnitingCare Children, Young People and
Families



© 2011 UnitingCare Children, Young People and Families

Prepared by Samia Michail, Principal Researcher – Program Development

Contact Person:

Sally Cowling, Manager, Research & Program Development
Social Justice Unit

UnitingCare Children, Young People and Families

PO Box W244, Parramatta NSW 2150

Phone 02 9407 3230, Fax: 02 9687 6349

Email: scowling@burnside.org.au

Website: www.childrenyoungpeopleandfamilies.org.au

CONTENTS

<u>Executive Summary</u>	<u>ii</u>
<u>1. Introduction</u>	<u>1</u>
1.1. Background	1
1.2. Literature Locale and Search	3
1.3. Challenging Behaviours	4
1.4. Impact of Exclusion from School	5
1.5. Disadvantaged Communities	7
1.6. Demographic Variables	8
<u>2. How do schools think about challenging behaviours?</u>	<u>9</u>
2.1. Different Approaches	10
2.1.1. Punitive Approaches	10
2.1.2. Academic Approaches	11
2.1.3. Therapeutic Approaches	12
2.1.4. Tailored Approaches	13
2.2. Social Constructions	14
<u>3. Key Elements of Inclusive School Responses</u>	<u>17</u>
3.1. A Multi-Tiered Approach	17
3.2. Collaboration across Domains	18
3.3. Strong Relationships	20
3.4. Restorative Justice	21
<u>4. Concluding Statements</u>	<u>22</u>
4.1. Limitations of this review	22
4.2. Key Points	23
<u>References</u>	<u>26</u>
<u>Appendix 1</u>	<u>32</u>

Executive Summary

When children present with challenging behaviour at school, there are various ways in which a school can respond. A particularly concerning response is the exclusion of a child from their learning, either through school suspension, expulsion or other punitive measures. This review addresses concerns about school suspension being increasingly used as a response to challenging behaviours and progressively more with students of younger ages, beginning in pre-school. This is a concern for non-government agencies seeking to foster positive school engagement as part of their service provision. The practice of suspending students from school is based on a philosophy of exclusion, not individual child wellbeing and therefore has negative, short and long-term consequences for children that can often result in a life of marginalisation. It also impacts the students' school setting, family and broader community. Research has shown that students from disadvantaged communities experience higher rates of school suspension. However, no causal links have been established. There are many factors that contribute to these higher rates of suspension which are structural but also stem from processes around discipline and pedagogy within schools. Some of these factors are considered in this paper.

This literature review presents an analysis of the underlying philosophies of school responses to challenging behaviours and practical measures that schools have implemented and some of the outcomes that have resulted. The review considers punitive approaches that are limited in their capacity to address any social, emotional, psychological or academic factors that may be contributing to the student presenting with challenging behaviour. It also looks at academic and therapeutic approaches which are better placed at focussing on the child's wellbeing but still remain insufficient. Finally, the review examines a more tailored approach to challenging behaviours which accounts for the whole ecology of the child and takes a more holistic view of why the behaviour exists. It surveys all the factors that impact behaviour at school, such as individual child characteristics, the school environment and the community of the child. It is an approach that is deemed the most successful in delivering positive educational and social outcomes for the child.

The literature has offered the opportunity to reflect on the social constructions of children and childhood that continue to permeate the way we respond to

children generally and in this context, students who behave in ways that are often perceived as challenging to adults. The dominant conversation about children's participation in decision making around their own lives connects students' genuine involvement in their learning with their ability to accept responsibility for their own actions. Ultimately, participation at school can mitigate the need for punitive measures to address behaviour.

A number of successful responses to challenging behaviours have been analysed from the literature and a number of common features are evident in programs considered to have reduced students' challenging behaviour. Firstly, responses need to be multi-tiered. This means at a primary level, preventing the behaviour before it is an issue by working with all students in the school. Intervention at a secondary level, would involve targeting students who might be at risk of exclusion for their behaviour. Interventions at a tertiary level require working intensely with students who have been excluded in some way to keep them engaged with their learning and avoid further exclusion.

Secondly, responses need to be collaborative. The child, their family and their community all need to be involved in the strategies that are used to modify student behaviour. This accounts for all the contexts in which the child is a part and allows consistency across all the child's domains. Thirdly, the child requires strong relationships with adults and peers that are familiar with their school environment and learning. Students who have solid rapport with their teachers and other staff at the school, such as counsellors, mental health staff, social workers and mentors are provided with increased opportunities to discuss their behaviour, participate in decisions around how to address their problems and be encouraged to take responsibility for their actions. Finally, responses based on restorative justice that aim to re-engage the student with their learning after a period of exclusion, hold the student in good stead for successful social and educational outcomes.

There are a range of options for schools to choose from when deciding how to address challenging behaviours in the learning environment. This decision should be made after careful consideration of the evidence for the success of non-punitive measures that consider the whole ecology of the child and focus on the wellbeing of the child. It is essential for students with challenging behaviours to remain engaged with their learning and to be socially included in their school in order that they achieve positive outcomes.

1. Introduction

1.1. Background

‘Challenging behaviours’ is a broadly used term which is difficult to specifically define. However, it generally refers to behaviour that is seen as abnormal within the context of a person’s culture. It can denote a range of behaviours such as self-injury, aggression, sexualised behaviour and abuse of property and often refers to more than one of these behaviours that co-exist. A commonly used definition of challenging behaviour is:

Any repeated pattern of behavior or perception of behavior that interferes with or is at risk of interfering with optimal learning or engagement with prosocial interactions with peers or adults. (Smith & Fox cited in Dunlap et al (2006, p5).

Within the context of school, children who exhibit challenging behaviours are considered at increased risk of academic failure, delinquency, dropping out, gang membership and adult incarceration (Dunlap 2006). These behaviours can be caused by biological, environmental, psychological and/or social factors and are a significant educational and social issue when they present at school. School responses to students’ challenging behaviour within the learning environment is varied but often involves exclusion of the student from their learning in some way. This can include suspension, expulsion or other forms of exclusionary practices.

Challenging behaviours at school are a concern to society (Nickerson and Spears, 2007), as schools are expected to be safe places for children to be. They are also of concern to principals and teachers who have a duty of care to provide a safe setting that facilitates learning and a secure and safe place of employment. Therefore, educational institutions must have some way to address the dynamics of school aggression and violence and have at the ready, prevention and intervention measures to reduce their incidence (Massey et al 2007). A long history of dealing with students who won’t follow the school rules and disrupt the classroom (Morris and Howard 2003) has meant that discipline has become an integral part of learning at school. It is also an issue that is difficult for schools to address (Hemphill and Hargreaves 2009). The common assumption is that students are engaged with their school and that school

suspension can potentially create a good learning environment through a period of contrasting disengagement for the student. However, this conviction is misplaced. Suspension is not a strategy that works for those marginalised at school and is not always appropriate for certain sub-groups of children within the school community (Nixon, personal communication). As such, schools need to find ways of working with their students and the community to address the complexity that is challenging behaviours.

This review has been undertaken by the *Social Justice Unit of UnitingCare Children, Young People and Families* (hereafter UCCYPF) which provides a range of services, across the continuum of care, to children, young people and families in New South Wales. The organisation is committed to fostering positive school engagement in the highly disadvantaged communities within which we work. However, UCCYPF staff have identified the increasing prevalence of school suspensions as a practice issue in service provision. There is concern about the increasing number of children who are suspended from school and the growing trend of children experiencing exclusion through suspension at a younger age and from as young as pre-school (Collin and Law 2001; Fahey et al 2007; Perry et al 2008; Phillips 2005). The use of suspension as a disciplinary practice is an Australian and international educational, policy and social issue, with evidence for the increased use of suspension from the United Kingdom, United States and to a lesser extent New Zealand. Furthermore, Haynes (2005, p334) reminds us that “Exclusion is more related to broader social purposes and not focussed on the wellbeing of the individual”. This leads us to inquire into why exclusion is perceived as an appropriate response to challenging behaviours, and to ask what the impact of this practice is in its many forms and what alternative child-centred responses may be employed.

UCCYPF also has a particular interest in the ‘middle years’, which is children aged between 9-14 years of age. This group of children are often overlooked when addressing children and young people’s issues, particularly when they are part of disadvantaged communities (NSW Parliamentary Committee 2009). Schooling during the middle years is the time when suspensions increase and disengagement from school escalates (Bland and Carrington 2009). Withers (2004, p31) describes how the skills acquired during primary school can ‘decay’ and that “excessive time out of school in the middle years may well exacerbate the ‘decay’ process”. In a search to discover more respectful and successful ways to work with children in the middle years, and to tackle this significant

educational and social issue, a review of the literature has been undertaken to explore current thinking and practice on responses to challenging behaviours.

This report discusses the literature available on the varied ways in which schools act in response to student behaviours. It presents a range of different approaches that schools adopt as they attempt to maintain a safe school environment and effective learning opportunities for children and young people. More specifically, the aim of this review is to analyse how schools practice student exclusion with a particular focus on school suspension in its many forms. The review also critiques school suspension as an appropriate response to challenging behaviours. It highlights the improvement in student behaviour and school climate when non-punitive and community collaborative approaches are implemented, particularly within a preventative framework.

The review is structured as follows. The introductory section provides some working definitions, contextualises the review and gives a brief picture of the impact on children of exclusion from school. Within this analysis, the intention is to provide 'conceptual research' knowledge and 'instrumental research' knowledge which combine to form an evidence-base for practice (Mildon et al 2010). Section Two considers the underlying philosophies of successful approaches which can be pertinent in bringing about social change. It does this by outlining four different approaches to addressing students' challenging behaviour. It also considers the link between these responses to different social constructions of children and their participation in learning. Section Three provides information about the practical steps required to address challenging behaviours through a discussion of some of the main elements found in successful programs, including using a multi-tiered approach, utilising collaboration across domains, creating strong relationships and models of restorative justice. The review concludes with some key points that have been drawn from the literature that refer to the benefits of using a combination of strategies, working collaboratively across several domains, engaging students in their learning and tailoring approaches that use a social construction of children as active, competent individuals.

1.2. Literature Locale and Search

The literature reviewed has been taken from the United States, United Kingdom, Australia and New Zealand from the ten years spanning 2001- 2010. The burgeoning of literature in 2003-04, may reflect the increasing emphasis on social inclusion policy that became popular at this time and the increase in

school violence (including massacres in the US). Consequently, the US literature has particularly related the issue of schools suspension to that of school violence. Articles have been sourced from a range of educational, psychological, social work, philosophical and health focussed peer-reviewed journals or other publications. A large proportion of articles were written from an educational perspective but research on suspension at school has been multi-disciplinary.

1.3. Challenging Behaviours

School exclusion is now becoming an accepted directive for a range of behaviours that are considered to put the school community at risk, such as violence, aggression and increasingly disruption. Lloyd et al (2003) describes the alarming tendency to use school suspension as punishment for other, less severe behaviours. Brownstein (2009) agrees that challenging behaviours are now defined more broadly and refers to "...truancy, tardiness and vague catch-all categories such as "insubordination" and "disrespect" as being commonly used. Traditionally challenging behaviours were seen as actions that put the school community at risk or involved conduct that was physically violent in nature, rendering students dangerous and warranting exclusion. However, they now also encompass those behaviours that are not aggressive but are perceived to produce psychological and developmental harm, for example, bullying, verbal abuse and suicide. Noguera (cited in, Nickerson and Spears 2007, p5) claims that "in schools, violence is often equated with insubordination, student misconduct, and disorder."

Kohn in McCluskey et al (2008) argues that often schools seek conformity and compliance for the sake of obedience. In Wales, it was found that 'illegal exclusions' were being used extensively and that students were being suspended on very questionable grounds (Reid 2009). Discipline not founded on clear evidence of student actions is not about children's learning but about maintaining the status quo of power structures within schools which presumably eases the task of teaching (Haynes 2005). It may be useful to reflect on the widening of behaviours that are perceived as 'challenging' and ask *to whom* are these behaviours challenging?

Children's resilience also interplays with the way challenging behaviour is perceived and impacts on engagement at school. The literature on children's ability to adapt positively in difficult circumstances (DFCSIA 2006) sees school engagement as critical to fostering resilience in children. It implies that school

suspension has a negative impact on the indicators of resilience which can include children's coping, competence, resourcefulness, internal locus of control, self-regulation and future orientation. Challenging behaviours have been reframed as resilience, in a forthcoming study by Bottrell and Armstrong, where young people's understanding of their risky and threatening behaviour was explored with them. The study suggests that challenging behaviours may be an indicator of resilience and that '...young people may participate in "risky" cultural activities and nonetheless value education and hold aspirations for employment and "getting on" in the future'. It might be the case that challenging behaviours are a method of communication used by children to show their dissatisfaction with the process of their schooling.

1.4. Impact of Exclusion from School

Evidence in the literature about the impact of school exclusion on children and young people, and their families within disadvantaged communities is limited but strongly suggests that the consequences of an infraction from school are severe and enduring for all involved. This includes not only the students themselves, but school staff, the school community, parents and families and the society at large (Nickerson and Spears 2007; Dunlap 2006).

Suspensions are usually demarcated as 'out-of school' or 'in-school' suspensions (Brownstein 2009). 'Out-of-school' suspensions are a defined period of time where the student is banned from entering the school grounds or attending classes. The student is then obligated to remain at home or in the community, disengaged from their learning for this set time. They may spend this time with or without supervision, as their family circumstances allow. In disadvantaged communities, families may have additional and/or complex needs that compound the lack of support available to the student when they are away from school. Secondly, the suspension may be 'in-school', where the student is segregated in some way from the other students but remains within the schools grounds and therefore within the duty of care of the school staff. Students can be left to bide their time with nothing to be engaged in, with or without teacher supervision. This puts a strain on school resources and does not always provide the student with any beneficial tasks to complete during this time resulting in forceful disengagement from learning.

Suspension is most likely to lead children into a life of marginalisation (Collin and Law 2001; Howarth 2004). Individual emotions such as shame, resentment, frustration and powerlessness are experienced by students who are excluded

from their school community (Partington 2001). This can occur as a result of an out-of-school suspension and/or an extended period of time on any form of suspension. A range of other negative feelings can emerge, such as alienation and positive attitudes towards antisocial behaviour (Taylor and Fairgray 2005). Most obviously, a repeated pattern of being excluded from school results in reduced academic achievement, disengagement from education and therefore reduced employment opportunities (Knipe et al 2007).

While there are not many studies on the long term impact of suspension, some have strongly linked school exclusion to antisocial behaviour and violent behaviour, at least within the subsequent 12 month period. Hemphill & Hargreaves (2009) showed that students in Australia and the United States who were suspended from school were 50% more likely to engage in antisocial behaviour and 70% more likely to engage in violent behaviour, clearly demonstrating the negative impact of school suspension over and above other influences. Brownstein (2009) indicates that when students are out of school, there is more opportunity for them to become involved in harmful conduct than if they were given an 'in-school' suspension where supervision is provided on school grounds. In serious circumstances, where the challenging student behaviour leads to a referral to the justice system, the links between school and crime are clear. Students perceive the school setting as resulting in their negative association with the law. In an Australian study, parents have shown disapproval for suspension that extricates the child from their learning, with Indigenous parents clearly stating a preference for 'in-school' suspensions where their child is still given work to do (Hayes et al 2009).

In addition to the impact on an individual student's wellbeing, Massey et al (2007) refer to the impact of suspension on a range of other stakeholders, including the school community (peers, teachers, counsellors, etc) and the community at large (parents, community workers, etc.). They discuss the disruption that occurs, how it affects the quality of teaching efforts, interrupts the learning and compromises the overall functioning of the school. Brownstein (2010) also points to a link between high rates of school exclusion, including suspension and expulsion, and the poor satisfaction ratings of staff and students with the school environment. Further research is required on the impact of exclusionary discipline policies on the wider community.

1.5. Disadvantaged Communities

There are now established and clear links between high student suspension rates and schools being located within disadvantaged communities (Lloyd et al 2003; Taylor and Fairgray 2005; Hemphill and Hargreaves 2009; Hemphill et al 2010, Nickerson 2007), as well as higher rates of school violence in schools located in disadvantaged communities (Brunson and Miller 2009). This is the case in Australia and internationally. Much of the literature on school suspension has been produced from studies conducted in these disadvantaged areas, identified as neighbourhoods of poverty, crime and low parental educational levels (Siraj-Blatchford 2009), among other factors. Nevertheless, this link does not necessarily support a *causal relationship* between disadvantage and challenging behaviours in students.

The stereotypical image of disadvantaged communities may be more significant in determining the use of suspension in schools. Nickerson and Spears (2007, p24) suggest "...that students from low SES backgrounds may be subject to more punitive discipline, regardless of crime in the neighbourhood". Hemphill et al (2010) reiterate that more punitive consequences of challenging behaviours may also be delivered in a less than professional manner. Schools that have a high proportion of students of a low socio economic status often administer punitive consequences more often and rely on formal administrative structures than philosophies of participation as compared to wealthy schools (Nickerson and Spears 2007, p8). These findings suggest that the school's perception of students, based on the neighbourhoods in which students live, can be a powerful motivator of disciplinary policy and procedure.

There are more tangible factors which influence not only suspension rates but also the approach a school chooses to implement to address disciplinary issues including school size, neighbourhood crime, location and school level (primary, or secondary) in addition to socioeconomic status (Nickerson and Spears 2007). However, the intangible variables that dictate the rate of school exclusion within schools *of the same* socioeconomic status are also worth noting. These include the level of parent and community involvement, resources at the disposal of the school and community, strength of leadership within the school, degree of commitment and skill of school staff and potency of collaboration between the school, family, community and the child. Siraj-Blatchford (2009) stresses that while families do have the capacity to support their children within circumstances of disadvantage; unfortunately, they are often unaware of this knowledge. She maintains that parents not only need the

understanding of the ways in which they can provide support to their children, but also the *will* and the *means* to do so. There is an underlying philosophy to this model which utilises the argument by Giddens (1984) that the effects of structural inequality can be overcome. This is certainly prevalent in the literature on children's resilience (see Newman 2002). In the context of school suspension, the inequality found in disadvantaged communities may be addressed by implementing a suspensions policy and process that does not reinforce exclusion as a response to challenging behaviour and by employing a collaborative approach that engages the whole community.

1.6. Demographic Variables

There has been a great deal of interest recently in the needs of children and young people aged between 9-14yrs of age, the middle years of childhood. These students are often transitioning from primary school to high school and the middle years is also a period where there is a sharp increase in school suspension. This has been attributed to the different structure of the high school system which is less personal as there is more than one teacher and usually more students in the class (Partington 2001). Other qualities of the high school system that can contribute to this trend are the narrower curriculum, increased emphasis on assessment and the focus on discipline despite the onset of adolescence and its many pressures at this age. Moreover, secondary schools have been noted as involving more violence and crime and are more likely to use authoritarian approaches than primary schools (Nickerson 2007, p23).

Gender, indigeneity and urban or rural school settings also impact on the trends in school suspension. In Australia and New Zealand, studies have shown that boys in school are more likely to be suspended than girls (Taylor and Fairgray 2005; Hemphill & Hargreaves 2009). Interestingly, urban schools are more likely to have violence prevention programs and conduct parent training whilst rural schools use suspension without curriculum options or support services more often (Nickerson 2007, p25). This may be related to a lack of resources in rural areas compared to urban schools but may also be closely tied to features specific to rural communities, as yet not defined. The overrepresentation of Aboriginal students in rural schools may also be an influence. With respect to Indigenous children, we are aware that they are overrepresented in the statistics on exclusion from school, poor school attendance and lower academic achievement in Australia (Hayes et al 2009; Griffiths and Rees 2007) and other countries (Hemphill & Hargreaves 2009). This is clearly linked to their cultural background and differences in the meaning of education and learning within

their culture. The trend is also apt to being influenced by many Aboriginal students living in rural parts of Australia, attending rural schools.

There is a dearth of discussion in the literature on how disengagement from school is linked with students in out of home care (Nixon 2008), in unstable housing or experiencing homelessness (FYA 2009), with disability or mental health issues. Lloyd et al (2003, p79) briefly mention that young people with special educational needs and those looked after away from home are over represented in the UK statistics. Dickinson and Miller (2006, p77) discuss some of the intricacies of determining if a student's challenging behaviour is caused by or related to their disability. They concede some of the ethical issues surrounding the removal of these students from the classroom when they are already 'facing daily academic hurdles' and the time in the classroom is critical. Loe and Feldman (2007) in their paper on academic and educational outcomes of children with ADHD confirm that the condition is associated with increased rates of detention and expulsion in the United States. Not enough research is available to inform us about how to improve learning outcomes of children diagnosed with ADHD, on the Autism Spectrum or with other disabilities. Additional research is requisite to form some conclusions about these unique groups of students and their prevalence and connections to school suspension.

2. How do schools think about challenging behaviours?

This section looks at some of the underlying philosophies of different school responses and the social constructions that may be associated with different ways of conceptualising school suspension.

One of the most influential features of a school that can impact school suspension rates is the stance of the school on *why* students present with challenging behaviour and then *how* it delivers scholarship in response to the student's circumstances that underlie the behaviour. Lloyd (2003, p79), states that the "...ethos and educational ideology of schools, and the way schools operate their disciplinary and support systems, effect the level of disciplinary exclusion." Many other authors support this view (see Hemphill and Hargreaves 2009; Hemphill et al 2010; Howarth 2004; Munn et al 2000 cited in Knipe 2007). The acclaimed program, *Positive Behavioural Interventions and Supports (PBIS)*, (Southern Poverty Law Centre 2009) implemented by 7000 schools

nationwide in the United States and at all grade levels, has shown to be effective in low socio economic status (SES) areas with high poverty and ‘at-risk’ students. The program claims to require “...a major shift in a school’s approach to discipline” and that it might be the answer to challenging student behaviour.

2.1. Different Approaches

Generally, most responses to unacceptable behaviour at school can be categorised into one of three approaches, be a combination of some or combination of all three. Nickerson and Spears (2007) and Morris and Howard (2003) have offered a representation of approaches described either as punitive measures, academic models, or therapeutically focussed programs. The fourth approach combines some or all of these methods in a tailored way to match the needs of the student. These approaches will each be discussed in detail.

2.1.1. Punitive Approaches

Punitive strategies involve blanket rules around what is and isn’t acceptable behaviour within a school environment. They do not take into account any individual personal, educational, developmental, social or other circumstances and apply the consequences to any breach of the rules as stated. These policies can be administered in different ways but are generally founded on the belief that this sort of response to challenging behaviours fosters a sense of disciplinary equity and consistency within the school community. It’s aimed at sending a clear message to all members about what behaviour will and will not be tolerated, thus setting clear boundaries.

Morris and Howard (2003) describe these punitive practices as being employed in an effort to punish the child, assuming that they have consciously and deliberately decided to cause trouble and that this penalising method will be corrective of that behaviour. This is sometimes referred to as the individual deficiency model where the student is seen as being at fault and someone that must be fixed. As stated above, this approach does not take into account any other contextual, historical or developmental factors that may be contributing to the child’s behaviour.

However, a large amount of the literature reviewed critiques these ‘zero-tolerance’ policies as an unsuccessful and inappropriate response to student’s challenging behaviours at schools (Collin and Law 2001; Hemphill & Hargreaves 2009; Brownstein 2010; American Psychological Association 2008;

Morrison 2007 in McCluskey et al 2008). In the United States, school violence has been perceived as increasing to crisis levels, despite remaining stable or having decreased since 1985. Nonetheless, the restricting of autonomy and increased focus on policing behaviour that has evolved is discussed as counterproductive. This is indicated in a number of ways. School suspensions in the US continue to rise, and have doubled from 1974 to 2006 (Brownstein 2010). There has been a disproportionate use of zero-tolerance policies with students of colour and disability and school climate is less satisfactory among students where these strategies are used (APA 2008). In addition, these punitive policies are inappropriate because they are incongruent with the current international commitment to, and ongoing emphasis on, social inclusion (Hemphill & Hargreaves 2009; McCluskey et al 2008). The social inclusion approach has been the most recently accepted view on working to address the needs of students who are disengaged with education.

One of the main reasons for the failure of zero-tolerance policies may be that, the policy utilises social exclusionary practices to maintain a harmonious learning environment. Exclusion segregates not only the student being suspended, but their family and friends. This in turn cultivates an atmosphere of tension and discord between students, teachers and the community and this may become cyclic. If students, parents and the community are not encouraged to share any of the personal conditions that may be fuelling the challenging behaviour, they in turn become unwilling to conform to the requirements of the school or to contribute constructively to a solution. They instead react negatively to the harsh and unrelenting policy that is universally applied.

Zero-tolerance policies are not used in Australia. Nonetheless, some aspects of various policies may still be punitive and aim to restrict the autonomy of students as a form of disciplinary response to behaviours that are not acceptable at school. Nickerson and Spears (2007) suggests that loss of student privileges, detention/Saturday school and keeping students off the bus for misbehaviour are other strategies used in schools to combat a breach of discipline that are based on an authoritarian philosophy. Hemphill et al (2010) among others recommends the reduced use of exclusionary discipline approaches.

2.1.2. Academic Approaches

A number of school responses to challenging behaviours seek to address the underlying academic concerns in an effort to reduce the difficult behaviour.

Morris and Howard (2003) detail some programs that are geared towards providing additional educational instruction and support as a response to students who are perceived to misbehave. It may be useful to students as it takes account of some of their unique traits and learning styles within the learning environment. A local example of this flexibility in curriculum delivery is the *Engaging Again* (See Appendix 1) intervention where learning is “...experiential, hands-on and utilises technology in learning” (Griffiths and Rees 2007, p4). It is a 20 week fully provided off-site interactive learning with a class size of 10 students.

However, this approach assumes that challenging behaviours develop as a result of insufficient development in the child’s academic ability and competency. While this may be the case for some students, for others, there may be further underlying social, environmental or psychological causes for their lack of aptitude. Modifying curriculum and using flexible delivery options is an approach that may have some merit for working on academic outcomes, however, for students from disadvantaged communities learning difficulties may result as a consequence of more deep seated struggles in other domains of their ecology. Therefore, this approach provides a limited response to challenging behaviour by not taking account of the broader contexts of children’s lives.

2.1.3. Therapeutic Approaches

Another type of approach to addressing students’ challenging behaviour is that of identifying other external motivations or conflicts within the individual student that need resolution. This means, the school and its staff understanding that there is an underlying problem that students need to work through in order to move forward and before they can modify their behaviour. Morris and Howard (2003) discuss programs with this approach that aspire to support students to acknowledge their struggle and reflect on and accept responsibility for their actions. Once again, this approach may have merit for students living in low socioeconomic status neighbourhoods where a number of social circumstances can affect their ability to engage well with their schooling. The rationale is that this approach takes an ecological perspective of the student, where they are positioned centrally whilst accounting for students as a heterogeneous group with differing capacities, capabilities, contexts and needs.

The *On-Campus Intervention Program (OCIP)* or *Think First* (Larson and McBride 1992) (See Appendix 1 for both) programs developed in the United States for secondary school students are examples of this therapeutic focus that can occur within the school role and during school time. *OCIP* requires counsellors to be at hand to provide individual or group attention to students who have been separated from other students. Students also complete academic work and are supervised by a teacher who can provide assistance. *Think First* (See Appendix 1) provides a 10 week curriculum in anger management and conflict resolution for secondary students. It has been empirically tested, is acknowledged as appropriate for building skills within the classroom, and is culturally sensitive. However, the critique of therapeutic approaches is shaped around programs that continue to ignore young people's experience and social context, young people having negative experiences of them and that they can lead to more punitive measures for the student if they fail to engage or respond to the advice and strategies suggested in the programs (Bottrell and Armstrong, forthcoming).

2.1.4. Tailored Approaches

The final approach consists of strategies that are consistent across the school and the home environment. They address the learning and individual social wellbeing of students and are considered the most adept at reducing challenging behaviours. Those programs that are both academic and therapeutic in nature, but also tailored to individual students, tend to provide a suite of options which cater for the range of circumstances in which students find themselves at risk of exclusion. In the UK, McCluskey et al (2008) indicate how tailored approaches conceptualise children's needs much more broadly and see barriers to children's learning as being pedagogical, institutional, social and/or individual. This has allowed provision to be made for life events that can affect children such as family bereavement, trauma, illness, giftedness and being talented. Within the context of disadvantage, this is a positive step towards an ecological and holistic approach to the provision of learning.

Siraj-Blatchford (2009) proposes 'cultural cultivation' as a pathway to improving children's learning outcomes, which extends beyond the classroom. Schools can account for the significant influence of home learning environments on children's intellectual and social development by enhancing the capacity of parents to engage their children in activities at home that are pedagogically beneficial. Her study involved children aged 3-11 years of age and showed that

providing supplementary opportunities for extra curricular activities, such as music lessons within disadvantaged communities is immensely useful. The only drawback of using this tailored approach is the investment of time and resources which are indispensable in addressing the needs of individual students in a range of contexts. It also requires a strong commitment to the principles behind the approach itself and school staff may not often work in this collaborative way outside of the school environment.

2.2. Social Constructions

Different schools choose different approaches to address challenging behaviours but often are unaware of, or have not examined closely, the underlying social constructions that have led them to their choice of response. A number of general social constructions can also surround the use of suspensions within the school system. Social perceptions exist about behaviour (what is acceptable in a school setting?), perceptions about children (how should a 'normal' child behave?), perceptions about childhood (what should children be doing until they are adults?), perceptions around violence (is it a social or individual issue?) and perceptions on deviance (what is deviant and how should it be treated?). For example, violence can be considered an appropriate response to conflict in many communities (Partington 2010, p332). These constructions (and others) shape the way in which we react and respond to different behaviours that students present with at school.

The way adults construct children has been the focus of the new sociology of childhood paradigm. It principally highlights that children being constructed as incompetent and passive can prevent them from being taken seriously by adults, in this case teachers and school staff. Fuelling this view of children as lacking ability and experience is the hegemony of developmental theories of childhood that prescribe specific skills to the age of the child (Hutchinson & Charlesworth 2000). Adults who only used a developmental lens to view children, which is common within an educational context, neglect to account for the knowledge and skills that children do have as a result of their experience in the world as opposed to how long they have been living. Furthermore, these developmental theories are often the source of curriculum development, where the tasks children are expected to complete at school are again based on their age rather than their competency. This is only one example of the way in which children may be constructed.

With respect to disadvantaged communities, the social construction of children at school can either draw out their strengths or multiply the lack of opportunity that they may encounter on the home front (Bottrell and Armstrong, forthcoming). In addition to dispiriting views of children based on age, children are often stereotypically constructed within particular dominant representations that exist in society. Race, for example may be one deeply stigmatising representation, but others include, being in care or living in poverty, or coming from a single parent family. Within a school context, a common construction is that of 'problem child' where 'behavioural problems have largely defined...student identity' (Bottrell and Armstrong, forthcoming). This would mean that children from disadvantaged communities can be doubly and triply constructed. In this way, social constructions might be considered to create layered disadvantage. Teacher's views of children contribute heavily to their commitment to address student behaviour in a respectful and collaborative way that can prevent suspension (Hemphill and Hargreaves 2009; APA 2008; Laluevein 2010). Hence, an awareness of teachers' perceptions of their students is crucial.

Sorin and Galloway (2005) suggest that there are a number of different constructions of children which may be detrimental to the way they are treated. A similar analysis of social constructions could be applied to behaviour, violence, etc. Therefore, it is valuable to reflect on the views of school staff on a range of concepts in order to determine if these underlying social constructions are influencing the choice of school response to challenging behaviour. Unpacking the social constructions at play in exclusion from school can be useful in distinguishing between different approaches. Punitive and partly academic approaches as described earlier would seem to be driven by social constructions of children as future citizens in the making with childhood as merely a stage of biological growth and maturity (Prout and James (1989). Therapeutic approaches, while they offer some acknowledgement of children as individuals within a social context that can impact their wellbeing, do not engage with the multiple parts of the student's ecology as completely as tailored approaches.

Adult attitudes around children's competency in particular are closely associated with issues of power and discipline, over which children have no control (Hemphill & Hargreaves 2009). Burton (2006) clearly outlines the link between teacher attitudes and children's outcomes following an incident of misbehaviour. Asymmetrical relationships of power exist in current educational

settings between students and teachers (Laluvein 2010) and consideration needs to be given to the power of teachers over children when analysing school responses to unacceptable behaviour (Brownstein 2009; Bottrell and Armstrong, forthcoming). A social construction of children as incompetent, coupled with an abuse of power (albeit often unintentional), can subsequently see the student as a passive consumer of education. Holdsworth (2005, p141) in his critique of school-based learning activities that are abstract and do not address the present experience and knowledge of the child implies that students can become either 'passive collaborators, or active resisters'. Therefore, disengagement from learning and challenging behaviours can simply be the next logical step in a sequence of apathy at school. An alternative view of children is of active, knowledgeable, interactive and competent individuals that proactively contribute to their own lives, the families and communities in which they live and to their own learning. This presents a very different frame in which to address challenging behaviour and allows the student be intimately involved in addressing their own behaviour by taking responsibility for their actions.

Children who are involved as active participants in their own learning at school have more success in modifying their behaviour and responding positively to behaviour programs (Elliot 2004; Laluvein 2010; Reid 2009). The concept of children's participation enshrined in *The United Nations Conventions on the Rights of the Child 1989* seems to be evident in schools that have achieved change in the classroom environment with respect to behaviour in particular. This has occurred as students have genuinely participated in decisions around their learning (Boylan and Wallace 2009; Cowling 2009; Laluvein 2010; Reid 2009). In order to foster engagement of students, they must be given serious things to do at school (Holdsworth 2005). Lloyd et al (2003) suggests listening to children's views but concedes that schools often don't have time to listen to students. Furthermore,

Schools that encourage responsible citizenship and an active community are on track to creating thoughtful and engaged civic-minded students with a sense of justice and equity who accept responsibility for protecting their rights and the rights of others."(Elliot 2004).

Within disadvantaged communities, Siraj-Blatchford (2009) has talked with children who said that being 'bored' led to misbehaviour and therefore lower

academic attainment. More significantly she noted children's agency as positively improving their own home learning environment. This resonates with a social construction of children as actively engaged in their own development and the tailored approach to challenging behaviours which integrates all the parts of a child's ecology within a response. It also reflects what we know about what contributes to resilience in children (Newman 2002). Ilona Bruveris (2006, slide 14) sums up this perspective nicely:

Challenging behaviour is reduced when children have opportunities to make choices, develop friendships, be leaders, take responsibility, be treated with respect, have their feelings supported and their frustrations attended to.

Unfortunately, the routine practice of not including children's perspectives or engaging them is evident even in the literature on school suspension where research presenting or examining children's views on ways of addressing student challenging misbehaviour is minimal. This is unfortunate because it is evident that children's strategies for maintaining compliance within school are different to those that adults prefer. For example, children are happy to use natural consequences such as an acceptance of responsibility for their actions in meeting the rules around behaviour (Partington 2001). One notable exception is the study by Bland et al (2009) where middle school students were researchers on disengagement and engagement in their own schools and peer groups. This work has resulted in those very students becoming engaged in their own educational issues and pursuing ways of working together with their teachers to learn.

3. Key Elements of Inclusive School Responses

This section looks at some of the more tangible and explicit actions that schools have used in their response to challenging behaviours of students at school.

3.1. A Multi-Tiered Approach

There are a number of stages at which student's behaviour can be tackled and at different intensities. Universal or primary intervention programs are designed for all students of a school and aim to bring about change on a wide level. Common examples of these include anti-bullying programs, declaring schools no-drug zones and the like. Targeted programs, sometimes called secondary intervention are steered towards a specific group of students within the school. In the case of school suspensions, students may be at-risk of suspension, have presented with challenging behaviours on a number of occasions and/or have

been identified as beginning to disengage with their learning. Examples may include anger management classes and group work on social skills development (Burton 2006). Individual or tertiary intervention programs are those intended to deal with behaviour after the event. School suspensions are an example of this. However, there are other examples that are not just punitive or which can be used in addition to exclusion: regular one-on-one counselling, alternative educational program and/or follow up intervention.

However, a key technique to shifting student behaviour is to use a multi-tiered tactic that utilises universal, targeted *and* individual programs (Massey et al 2007; Reid 2009). The *Positive Behaviour Supports (PBS)* program (see Appendix 1) is the prime example of this approach in the United States that has demonstrated that addressing student behaviour on a number of levels is very successful, particularly in disadvantaged communities. In the UK, the *Safe Schools/Healthy Students Initiative* (see Appendix 1) is well known for its preventative social skills training being provided in combination with secondary mental health and tertiary behavioural services. The right combination of short term, medium and long term programs, customised to child, school and community needs is widely regarded as a valuable *modus operandi*. Implementing universal and targeted interventions provides preventative and proactive measures that can assist in moderating challenging behaviours before they occur. Tertiary interventions can then be maintained as a necessary course of action in the most extreme cases.

3.2. Collaboration across Domains

A large volume of the literature supports a collaborative multi-sector approach to working with issues of challenging student behaviour. Strong links between school, community, and family are unmistakably one of the most fundamental and vital elements of the most promising programs (Collin and Law 2001; Cowling 2009; Massey et al 2007; Partington 2001) regardless of other strategies that are being utilised (Riordan 2006). These links are said to increase student self esteem (Riordan 2006) and even children considered these connections as essential where students were in danger of being suspended, expelled or already had been excluded (Knipe et al 2007). This indicates that they perceived these links between school and family as needing to occur as a preventative measure, not only after suspension had occurred.

Studies on the impact of school-based support, such as social workers (Johnson et al 2006) and mental health workers (Nickerson and Spears 2007) demonstrated the when students were involved with support staff who could cross a number of domains, the student responded well. The range of interventions carried out by social workers in the American study by Johnson et al (2006, p262) included:

...escorting students to court hearings, working with probation officers, helping with paperwork required for enrolling in alternative educational programs, providing information about services for siblings...holding training seminars for parents and families, and putting families in touch with community resources...supported families as they re-enrolled their children in school, and worked with appropriate school counsellors to ensure the students received continued support after they returned to school...

One of the basic elements of collaboration within an educational context is a 'whole of school approach' (Reid 2009; Hemphill et al 2010). The principal purpose of educational systems is controversial and many would argue that the key responsibility of schools is to provide children with an academic education. However, Massey et al (2007, p59) suggest that schools do need to address aggression and violence in preventative and intervening approaches, as a part of that educational aim. When the whole school body is occupied with positive changes in the school environment, it builds a shared knowledge of the issues and a collaborative way to address them.

In a small South Australian primary school, the *Learnsapes* program (See Appendix 1) has been used to connect with the culture of the Indigenous community through its core component of active participation of students, teachers, parents and community groups. This participation takes place in all stages of the program, beginning with planning and designing what the school place will look like (Boylan and Wallace 2009).

Recognition of the success of collaborative responses is also evident in the recommendations of a State parliamentary inquiry into strategies to prevent high volume offending and recidivism by young people that highlights the participation of children in their own education as key to maintaining their engagement at school. This was particularly the case for vulnerable children (Victorian Parliament 2009, p.143). This is an appropriate position with respect

to students from disadvantaged communities being considered for suspension. The Inquiry's recommendations stressed the importance of parental involvement with the school, support for students transitioning from primary to secondary school, implementation of restorative justice practices in schools, additional training for teachers on the emotional wellbeing of children, identifying early on those students who are at-risk, linking them with social support and the need for additional resources be provided to schools to achieve these outcomes. These recommendations are in line with many of the findings of studies discussed in this literature review.

3.3. Strong Relationships

In the many programs that have been reviewed in the literature, the one component that seems to always be associated with positive outcomes is the establishment of a close relationship between the student presenting with challenging behaviours and a supportive adult within or closely associated with the school. Burton (2006) describes the use of group work focussing on self-reflection and problem solving strategies as effective, yet highlights that the relationship between the student and the teacher/facilitator is essential for positive outcomes. Morris and Howard (2003) as they discuss a range of approaches to address behaviour in schools, ultimately stress that a supportive adult needs to build individual rapport with the student. The *Check & Connect* program (see Appendix 1), although a tertiary intervention, stresses that the student who has been suspended should meet with a teacher several times a week following their return to school to receive support. This allows a strong relationship to form between a student who has experienced exclusion to ensure that they regain a sense of belonging and to replace the exclusionary experience with inclusive practices.

Altshuler (2003) conducted focus groups with students from middle school, their teachers and caseworkers with children in foster care. He concluded that successful practices included 'trusting relationships' and the participants themselves identified the need for a supportive person who they could rely on and who was familiar with the school system. Bottrell and Armstrong (forthcoming) found that "With positive relationships and facilitated co-operation, abiding by rules is "easy" [for students]'. This implies that the power dynamics that exist within a school structure are influential, and children are invariably in a less powerful position than adults and staff. This observation parallels comments made in Section 2 on the social constructions of children and childhood over which they also have no control but clearly underlie outcomes

for children who misbehave. In a conversation about the power within schools, Howarth (2004) suggests that for the student, a positive relationship with a person in power, for example a teacher, can provide the student with a way to influence how they are perceived by the school. He states:

Hence, in relationships that offer positive and congruent representations of one's social groups, pupils have the opportunity to participate in the social construction of their communities and so develop positive self-identities. (p370).

In essence, this positive relationship offers some control over teacher attitudes towards the student. The personal liaison with the student extends the teacher's knowledge of the student's context which is commonly hidden from teachers, and may provide a depth of understanding of the challenging behaviour. This, in turn, is encouraging for the student and helps them see themselves in a different light.

Drolet et al (2006) suggest that employing school social workers was one of the best pathways to reducing challenging behaviours in students as they made connections not only with the students but with the parents and that "the complexity of the relationship is a key element on which the social worker may build a collaborative framework" (p208). They hint that the earlier these ties are made, the stronger they become over time and result in increased collaboration between school and family domains. Laluein (2010) who is concerned with 'Communities of Practice' as a model of social inclusion sees partnerships between teachers and parents as being able to "overcome the problematic of status and power" (p186), which he says can undermine successful communication between school and family.

3.4. Restorative Justice

Relationships have also been acknowledged as basic to maintaining discipline within schools through the concept of restorative justice practices. These practices have as their basic premise, "the need to restore good relationships when there has been conflict or harm; and develop a school ethos that reduces the possibilities of such conflict arising" (McCluskey et al 2008, p405). The *Scottish Restorative Practice Project* (see Appendix 1) clearly illustrates these practices. Not only is establishing positive relationships between students and school staff important, but so is re-establishing them if they have been severed. Once again, the motivation behind the concept is to maintain the school as

socially inclusive, which is in sharp contrast to many discipline policies aimed at addressing challenging behaviours based on exclusion. Restorative practices usually rely on a 'whole of school' approach (Hemphill and Hargreaves 2009; Hemphill et al 2010) where students, staff and parents, the whole school community has a part to play in bringing about behavioural change. However, this program has also been implemented in very individualised ways where students and staff enter into a personal relationship to address behaviour (McCluskey et al 2008). In either way, restorative justice practices work within a paradigm of respect for children and their agency, flexibility and a willingness to accept that educating students is a multi-dimensional and complex task for which schools are responsible.

4. Concluding Statements

4.1. Limitations of this review

There is a paucity of Australian studies on the impact of school suspension on family and community. Although some studies have addressed long term outcomes for children and a few have provided information on the effects on school climate, the wider ripple effects to other stakeholders have not been researched well. Also, knowledge around the impact or processes of school exclusion for the middle years is not known. A number of studies have focussed on 14-19yrs (predominantly the high school/adolescent age group) and some on the early years (3-7yrs primary age group) but there is considerably less research relating to the 'Missing Middle', 7-14years age group.

Student ethnicity is seen to be a very influential variable on the use of suspension in US literature and has produced some differences in research coming out of Scotland and England. However, few studies have examined exclusion as a response to discipline with students from culturally and linguistically diverse backgrounds in Australia. Furthermore, very little has been written on Indigenous students despite their sharp overrepresentation in suspension rates. Hence, further research is needed to consider the role of ethnicity and indiginity on suspension rates and trends in Australian schools.

A key oversight in the literature is research that explores the influences that community organisations can have on reducing the use of suspension as a disciplinary policy in schools and the alternatives they may be able to offer. In the face of extensive evidence in favour of community involvement and several programs having been designed around this principle, very few investigations

on the exclusion from school indicate clearly *why* strong links with community organisations are a positive strategy. Research has not tapped into the potential of the community to address discipline and behaviour within the school setting.

Despite these limitations, a number of key points can be made about how schools can best respond to students' challenging behaviours.

4.2. Key Points

A key finding from the literature is that both a contextual and structural perspective needs to be adopted in addressing the use of suspension in education. That is, child characteristics, community makeup and school features all combine to influence suspension rates. The multiple contexts in which the child learns can be improved through an understanding of the underlying causes of the behaviour, strong relationships with supportive adults, flexible curriculum development delivery and individually tailored responses to their needs.

A school's most basic perspective of their students, their school and their community will shape their response to students with challenging behaviour. A social construction of children as incompetent and passive precedes their objectification within the education system, as witnessed by the labelling of children as troublemakers and failures. A 'deficit view' sees the student's misbehaviour and exclusion from school as a result of only student characteristics and their background. The deficit image of children leads people to respond to inappropriate behaviour using punitive measures (Bottrell and Armstrong, forthcoming) that expect the individual to change frequently without support and to make that change external to the school. This in effect shifts the responsibility out to the community. Exclusionary practices experienced at a young age will likely lead to ongoing and intergenerational exclusion in later life. However, experiences of socially inclusive practices at an early age will model appropriate social behaviour for children.

Adopting inclusive practices within the school milieu by prioritising preventative and proactive school-based solutions at primary, secondary and tertiary levels of intervention is prudent. Students in general can gain from violence prevention and wellbeing programs as do students at risk and students who have experienced exclusion. A holistic approach to behavioural issues and embedding this approach in all aspects of school life, leads to a range of potential pathways for maintaining student discipline.

It can be said however, that strong links between community, school and family are indispensable and fit well within a model of inclusive practice. It is also well suited to the ecological model of care on which the vision of UCCYPF is based. Although a local and customized model of these links is well recognised in the literature, they can be diverse in the way they are established, function and are maintained. Which combinations of strategies are most effective is not universal and a particular model cannot simply be applied to all communities.

The main element of successful responses embedded in the studies reviewed is collaboration to meet the needs of students, particularly those from disadvantaged communities. In developing a response to challenging behaviour, schools need to be flexible and tailor their response to the child and their varied contexts, including the resources available within the school community. In essence this may require a combination of approaches to a student's behaviour which include consideration of their academic, developmental and therapeutic needs. Punitive approaches are not considered to be constructive responses as they do not represent a response to student behaviour based on the individual child but a preset regime of punishment. However, where exclusion is part of established educational policy, Nickerson and Spear (2007) advise that suspension with services that support educational and therapeutic needs is a preferred option than enforcing exclusion of a student from school without services.

Collaboration is often about relationships between teachers and parents. They can each play a role in preventing suspensions. Where parents and the community are seen as partners not problems then it is possible to forge sturdy connections on which to base open and constructive communication between all stakeholders. This is one of the key solutions to addressing student behaviour. At times, a third party may be useful in facilitating positive relationships between parents and their child's school because of the inherent power imbalance, particularly where this has been intensified because a child has been suspended or is at risk of suspension. Community organisations are particularly well placed to take up this role, as are school-based social workers or mental health support staff.

Teachers and parents may not always be equipped with the specialist skills required to meet all the social and emotional needs of children within their responsibility. Community organisations such as UCCYPF provide many

specialist services within established relationships with children and their families. Access to these professional services would be of benefit not only to the student in terms of their education but also to their wellbeing. It is also of advantage to the school staff and wider community to see their students well supported. Furthermore, training for teachers is important, not only around how to work with children in individualised ways on social and emotional issues, but more principally on awareness of how these issues can impact their behaviour and associated engagement in learning at school.

In conclusion, different combinations of strategies that are locally positioned, coupled with strong school leadership can reduce school suspension rates and increase student engagement in learning. More specifically, the findings drawn from this literature review point to the importance of a tailored approach to each child's needs which best avoids a construction of children that is stereotypical. The response should instead be informed by evidence where the child is the primary source of information about their experiences, difficulties, challenges and mostly strengths. This approach creates space for input from teachers on educational progress but also makes room for community programs, parents and other support staff to contribute their perspectives and work together on the best strategies for behaviour management and promoting engagement.

References

Altshuler, Sandra. (2003) 'From barriers to successful collaboration: Public schools and child welfare working together'. *Social Work*. 48, 1, 52-63.

American Psychological Association (2008) 'Are zero tolerance policies effective in the schools? An evidentiary review and recommendations'. *American Psychological Association*. 63, 9, 852-862.

Bottrell, D. and Armstrong, D. (forthcoming) 'Local resources and distal decisions: the political ecology of resilience'. In M.Ungar (ed) *The Social Ecology of Resilience: Culture, Context, Resources and Meaning*. (Springer 2011)

Boylan, Colin. And Wallace, Andrew. (2009) 'Engaging with Learnsapes: Connecting Community and School'. *The Australian Journal of Indigenous Education*, 38, 94-102.

Bland, Derek and Carrington, Suzanne. (2009) 'Young people, imagination and re-engagement in the middle years'. *Improving Schools*, 12, 3, 237-248.

Brownstein, Rhonda. (2009) 'Pushed Out'. *Teaching Tolerance*. Fall 2009, 58-61. www.teachingtolerance.org

Brunson, R. and Miller, J. (2009) 'Schools, Neighbourhoods, and Adolescent Conflicts: A Situational Examination of Reciprocal Dynamics', *Justice Quarterly*, 26, 2, 183-210.

Bruveris, I (2006) Challenging Behaviours, Children's Hospital Education Research Institute *Hippocrates and Socrates XI: A Powerful Partnership Conference*, September 2006, Sydney http://www.cheri.com.au/PDF_Files/CHERI%20XI%20Conf%202006/print%20version/PVBruverisIlona.pdf Accessed 20/9/10.

Burton, Sheila. (2006) 'Over to You': Group work to help pupils avoid school exclusion.' *Educational Psychology in Practice*. 22, 3, 215-236.

Collin, Garry and Law, Linwood (2001) 'Suspended: When will they ever learn?' *Childrenz Issues*. 5, 1, 17-22.

Cowling, Sally. (2009) 'Suspending welfare payments to promote school attendance: Strange logic, unlikely outcomes and a better way.' *ACOSS National Conference, 2-3 April 2009, Sydney.*

Dickinson, M. and Miller, T. (2006) 'Issues Regarding In-school Suspensions and High School Students with Disabilities', *American Secondary Education*, 35, 1, 72-83.

Dunlap, G. (2006) Behavior Supports and Families: Inseparable Concerns. University of South Florida, http://www.challengingbehavior.org/explore/presentation_docs/7.04_behaviour_support.pdf Accessed 20/9/2010.

Dunlap, G., Strain, P., Fox, L., Carta, J. Conroy, M., Smith, B., Kern, L., Hemmeter, M., Timm, M., McCart, A., Sailor, W., Markey, U., Markey, D., Lardieri, S. and Sowell, C. (2006) 'Prevention and Intervention With Young Children's Challenging Behavior: Perspectives Regarding Current Knowledge.' *Behavioral Disorders*, 32, 1, 29-45.

Drolet, M., Paquin, Maryse and Soutyrine, Magnolia (2006) 'Building Collaboration Between School and Parents: Issues for school social workers and parents whose young children exhibit violent behaviour at school', *European Journal of Social Work*, 9, 2, 201-222.

Elliot, Alison (2004) 'Alternatives to School Suspension', *Australian Council for Educational Research*, e-News, www.acer.edu.au/enews/2004/03/alternatives-to-school-suspensions Accessed 30/7/10.

Fahey, C., Ihle, P., Macary, S. and O'Callahan, C. (2007) 'Opportunity Knocks: A Connecticut School-Community Partnership Closes the Door on Preschool Expulsion.' *Young Children*, 62, 2, 21-24.

Foundation for Young Australians, Brotherhood of St Laurence and Hanover (2009) Education Development Project: Improving educational and housing outcomes for children experiencing homelessness –Final Evaluation Report. <http://www.cnet.ngo.net.au/index.php?option=content&task=view&id=50514> Accessed 30/10/10.

Giddens, Anthony. (1984) *The Constitution of Society*. University of California Press: USA

Griffiths, W. and Rees, P. (2007) 'Engaging again: a special project for Indigenous students'. *Boys in Schools Bulletin*. 10, 2, 2-5.

Hayes, Debra., Johnston, Ken., Morris, Kristal., Power, Kerith. and Roberts, Dianne. (2009) 'Difficult Dialogue: Conversations with Aboriginal parents and caregivers'. *Australian Journal of Indigenous Education*. 38, 55-64.

Haynes, B. (2005) 'The paradox of the excluded child'. *Educational Philosophy and Theory*. 37, 3, 333-341

Hemphill, Sheryl. and Hargreaves, John. (2009) 'The impact of school suspensions: A student wellbeing issue'. *ACHPER Healthy Lifestyles Journal*. 56, (3/4), 5-11.

Hemphill, Sheryl. and Hargreaves, John. (2010) 'Suspension: quick fix or lasting harm?' *Teacher*. 207, 52-55.

Hemphill, Sheryl A., Toumbourou, John W., Smith, Rachel., Kendall, Garth., Rowland, Bosco., Freiberg, Kate. and Williams, Joanne. (2010) 'Are rates of school suspension higher in socially disadvantaged neighbourhoods? An Australian study'. *Health Promotion Journal of Australia*, 21, 1, 12-18.

Holdsworth, R. (2005) 'Taking Young People Seriously means Giving Them Serious Things to Do', In J. Mason and T. Fattore (eds) *Children Taken Seriously*. Children in Charge 12. Jessica Kingsley Publishers.

Howarth, Caroline. (2004) 'Re-presentation and resistance in the context of school exclusion: Reasons to be critical'. *Journal of Community & Applied Social Psychology*. 14, 356-377.

Hutchinson, E. and Charlesworth, L. (2000) 'Securing the welfare of children: Policies past, present and future', *Families in Society: The Journal of Contemporary Human Services*, 8, 1 6, 576-595.

Johnson, J., Sparks, E., Lewis, R., Niedrich, K. et al (2006) 'Effective Counseling Strategies for Supporting Long-Term Suspended Students'. *Professional School Counseling*, 9, 3 261-264.

Knipe, D., Reynolds, M. and Milner, S. (2007) 'Exclusion in schools in Northern Ireland: the pupil's voice'. *Research Papers in Education*, 22, 4, 407-424.

Laluvein, Jackie. (2010) 'Parents, Teachers and the "Community of Practice"', *The Qualitative Report*, 15, 1, 176-196.

Larson J. and McBride, J. (1992) *Think First: Anger and aggression management for secondary level students* (Treatment Manual). Whitewater, WI:Author.

Lloyd, G., Stead, J. and Kendrick, A. (2003) 'Joined-up approaches to prevent school exclusion', *Emotional and Behavioural Difficulties*, 8, 1, 77-91.

Loe, Irene and Feldman, Heidi. (2007) 'Academic and Educational Outcomes of Children with ADHD', *Journal of Pediatric Psychology*, 32, 6, 643-654.

Massey, Oliver T., Boroughs, Michael and Armstrong, Kathleen H. (2007) 'School Violence Interventions in the Safe Schools/Healthy Students Initiative', *Journal of School Violence*, 6, 2, 57-74.

McCluskey, G., Gwynedd, L., Kane, J., Riddell, S., Stead, J., and Weedon, E. (2008) 'Can restorative practices in schools make a difference?', *Educational Review*, 60, 4, 405-417.

Mildon, R., Bromfield, L., Arney, F., Lewig, K., Michaux, A. and Antcliff, G. (2010) 'Facilitating evidence-informed practice: Participatory knowledge translation and exchange', *Association of Child Welfare Agencies Conference*, August 2010, Sydney.

Morris, Robert and Howard, Angela. (2003) 'Designing and effective In-school Suspension Program.', *The Clearing House*, 76, 3, 156-159.

Newman, T. (2002) *Promoting Resilience: A review of effective strategies for childcare services*. (Barnardos Paper). Exeter: Centre for Evidence Based Social Services, University of Exeter, UK.

Nickerson, A. and Spears, W. (2007) 'Influences on Authoritarian and Educational/Therapeutic Approaches to School Violence Prevention', *Journal of School Violence*, 6, 4, 3-31.

Nixon, Dianne. (2008) 'Four years of research into practice: targeted methods for improving education results for children and young people in foster care.' *Association of Child Welfare Conference*, 18-20 August 2008, Sydney.

NSW Parliamentary Committee on Children and Young People (2009) *Inquiry into Children Young People aged 9-14yrs*. Report No 5/54. Available from www.nsw.parliament.nsw.gov.au Accessed 20/08/2010.

VIC Parliament (July 2009) *Inquiry into Strategies to Prevent High Volume Offending and Recidivism by Young People – Final Report*. Available from www.vic.parliament.vic.gov.au Accessed 20/08/2010. Drugs and Crime Prevention Committee.

Partington, Gary. (2001) 'Student Suspensions: The influence on students and their parents'. *Australian Journal of Education*. 45, 3, 323-340.

Perry, D. Dunne, M., McFadden, L. and Campbell, D. (2008) 'Reducing the Risk for Preschool Expulsion: Mental Health Consultation for Young Children with Challenging Behaviors.' *Journal of Child and Family Studies*, 17, 44-54.

Phillips, Stephen. (2005) 'Nursery children clock up most expulsions', *The Times Educational Supplement*, 4636, 20. www.tes.co.uk/article.aspx?storycode=2103691, Accessed 17/09/10.

Prout, A. and James, A. (1990) 'A new paradigm for the sociology of childhood? Prevalence, Promise and Problems.' In A. James and A. Prout (eds) *Constructing and Reconstructing Childhood: Contemporary Issues in the Sociological Study of Childhood*. London: Falmer Press.

Reid, Ken. (2009) 'Improving attendance and behaviour in Wales: The action plan', *Educational Studies*, 36, 3, 233-247.

Riordan, Geoff. (2006) 'Reducing student 'suspension rates' and engaging students in learning: principal and teacher approaches that work.' *Improving Schools*. 9, 3, 239-250.

Siraj-Blatchford, Iram. (2009) 'Learning in the home and at school: how working class children 'succeed against the odds'.' *British Educational Research Journal*, 36, 3, 463-482.

Sorrin, Reesa and Galloway, Greta (2006) 'Constructs of Childhood: Constructs of Self', *Children Australia*, 31, 2, 12-21.

Student Welfare Directorate (2007) *Student Discipline in Government Schools: Suspension and Expulsion of School Students – Procedures* (PD 2006/0316). Department of Education and Training. https://www.det.nsw.edu.au/policies/student_serv/discipline/stu_discip_gov/suspol_07.pdf Accessed 30/10/10.

Taylor, Louise and Fairgray, Henny. (2005) 'Natural Justice Suspended.' *Childrenz Issues*. 9, 1, 28-31.

Southern Poverty Law Center (2008) 'The building blocks of positive behaviour.' *Teaching Tolerance*. No. 34. www.tolerance.org Accessed 9/8/10.

Tilling, Julia. (2008) 'Resilience Helping At-risk Students'. Teacher: *The National Education Magazine*. Feb 2008, 4-6.

Withers, Graeme. (2004) 'Disenchantment, Disengagement, and Disappearance: Some recent statistics and a commentary on non-attendance in school.' *Learning Choice Expo Sydney 23-24 June 2004*, Dusseldorp Skills Forum, Australian Council for Educational Research.

Prepared by Samia Michail, Principal Researcher

Contact Person:

Sally Cowling, Manager Research and Development
Research and Program Development team, Social Justice Unit
UnitingCare Children, Young People and Families
PO Box W244, Parramatta NSW 2150
Phone 02 9407 3228, Fax: 02 9687 6349
Email: scowling@burnside.org.au

Appendix 1

Name of Program	Type of Approach	Level of intervention*			Description	Reference/ Source
		1	2	3		
Positive Behaviour Supports (PBS)	Whole school approach	✓	✓	✓	A combination of multi-tiered prevention strategies that are evidence-based, developed school wide but require teacher buy in and a whole of school approach.	Brownstein, Rhonda. (2010) 'Pushed Out'. Teaching Tolerance. Fall 2009, 58-61. www.teachingtolerance.org
Safe Schools/ Healthy Students Initiative	Individual social, behavioural and mental health orientation	✓	✓	✓	A combination of Think First, OCIP, Social Skills Training and mental/behavioural health services.	Massey, Oliver T., Boroughs, Michael and Armstrong, Kathleen H. (2007) 'School Violence Interventions in the Safe Schools/Healthy Students Initiative'. <i>Journal of School Violence</i> , 6, 2, 57-74.
Learnsapes	Whole school,	✓	✓		Use of the school's outdoor environment for learning purposes but has a core element of active participation by students, parents and the community.	Boylan, Colin. And Wallace, Andrew. (2009) 'Engaging with Learnsapes: Connecting Community and School', <i>The Australian Journal of Indigenous Education</i> , 38, 94-102
Think First	Individual emotional, social and behavioural		✓		Anger management and conflict resolution 10 week curriculum for secondary students, empirically tested for building skills within the classroom and is culturally sensitive.	Larson J. and McBride, J. (1992) Think First: Anger and aggression management for secondary level students (Treatment Manual). Whitewater, WI:Author.
On-Campus Intervention Program (OCIP)	Academic, emotional and behavioural		✓		Student remains at school but separate from other students, completes academic work, supervised by a teacher and a counsellor is available to provide individual or group intervention.	OCIP (2005) http://civilrightsproject.ucla.edu
Check & Connect	Individual academic, social and behavioural			✓	Student meets one-on-one with a teacher several times a week to receive support.	Brownstein, Rhonda. (2010) 'Pushed Out'. Teaching Tolerance. Fall 2009, 58-61. www.teachingtolerance.org
Scottish Restorative Practice Project	Restorative Justice			✓	A range of meetings, activities and lessons based on fostering mutual engagement and accountability, empathy and fairness.	McCluskey, G., Gwynedd, L., Kane, J., Riddell, S., Stead, J., and Weedon, E. (2008) 'Can restorative practices in schools make a difference?', <i>Educational Review</i> , 60, 4, 405-417.
Engaging Again	Academic and individual			✓	20 week intervention with a class size of 10, based off-site until a re-integration structure of half-day interactive learning with half-day classroom based learning until student can return to the class.	Griffiths, W. and Rees, P. (2007) 'Engaging again: a special project for Indigenous students'. <i>Boys in Schools Bulletin</i> . 10, 2, 2-5.